



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,241	12/05/2003	William E. Archer	1-15822	9180

7590 07/11/2005

Attn: Stephen P. Evans, Esq.
Marshall & Melhorn, LLC
Four SeaGate, 8th Floor
Toledo, OH 43604

EXAMINER

SCHWARTZ, CHRISTOPHER P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3683

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/729,241	Applicant(s) ARCHER, WILLIAM E.	
	Examiner Christopher P. Schwartz	Art Unit 3683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 12-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-8, 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Christopher P. Schwartz
CHRISTOPHER P. SCHWARTZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed 4/4/05 has been received and considered. Claims 1-8,10-20 are pending in the application. Claim 9 has been canceled, the limitations of which have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5,12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramoto in view of Paisley and Myers or Prillinger.

Regarding claim 1 Muramoto discloses a device similar to applicants in figure 4 including a rotor and stator assembly at 132,134, fluid pressure operated pistons at 142,144, a spring at 162 and a pressure plate, as broadly claimed, at 136.

Muramoto lacks showing a plurality of interleaved rotor and stator discs.
Muramoto also lacks showing complementary shaped first and second pistons.

Paisley is similar to the prior art figures of Muramoto in that a plurality of these interleaved discs are shown in figure 2 at 58,60. Note also the similarity in the actuating mechanism with that of Muramoto.

The references to Myers or Prillinger show independently operated and complementary shaped service and parking pistons. See Myers 90 and 92. See Prillinger 122 and 124.

It would have been obvious to have modified the device of Muramoto to include a plurality of each of the discs for increased braking ability and to include complementary shaped pistons such that one piston is capable of receiving at least "a portion" of the other would have amounted simply to an obvious engineering choice of design to that taught by Muramoto, in light of the teachings of Myers and Prillinger et al. It is noted that applicant lacks any criticality in the specification for this complementary shape.

Further, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled worker in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the device of Muramoto to include a plurality of each of the discs, as taught by Paisely, for increased braking ability.

Regarding claim 2 to have provided a "hub" arrangement per se in Muramoto, as taught by Paisely at 50, would have been an obvious alternative equivalent engineering choice of design.

Regarding claim 3 it is notoriously well known in the art to fix stator plates with splined connections to a non-rotatable element of the brake device, such as the housing, as opposed to using dowel pins. Such a modification to a pack of stators 134 provided with splines that could match those on the inside of 136 would be an obvious alternative choice of connection.

Regarding claims 4, as clearly seen in the drawings, these requirements are met.

Regarding claim 5, as broadly claimed, note the "spider" at 126.

Regarding claim 12 these requirements are met.

Regarding claim 13 see figure 5 at 144.

Regarding claims 14-20 these requirements are met.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 6-8,10,11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8,10-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher P. Schwartz whose telephone number is 571-272-7123. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Bucci can be reached on 571-272-7099. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cps
7/05/05


CHRISTOPHER P. SCHWARTZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER